DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 568 CG 015 593

AUTHOR Gutek, Barbara A.
TITLE Experiences of Sexual Harassment: Results from a Representative Survey.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHHS), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE Aug 81
GRANT NIMH-USPHS-MH-32606-01
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (89th, Los Angeles, CA, August 24-26, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Employed Women; Employee Attitudes; *Employer Employee Relationship; Expectation; Interpersonal Relationship; Negative Attitudes; *Organizational Climate; Power Structure; *Sex Differences; Sexuality; *Social Behavior; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Sexual Harassment

ABSTRACT

Sexual harassment at work has recently received considerable attention. Working men (N=405) and women (N=827) in Los Angeles County responded to questions about respondent's work, job characteristics, and work climate. Other questions concerned the respondent's experience of socio-sexual behaviors on current and previous jobs, definitions of sexual harassment, attitudes about male-female interaction at work, and demographic characteristics. Results from descriptions of respondents' experiences showed that, compared to those of men, the comments of women about sexual touching, expected socializing, or expected sexual activity were more likely to be called sexual harassment by an independent rater. In terms of definitions of sexual harassment, women were more likely than men to consider certain behaviors as sexual harassment. Descriptions of initiators of sexual activities, information concerning negative consequences of sexual harassment, issues of organizational ambience, and worker attitudes suggest that a great deal of ambiguity surrounds the issue of sexuality at work. (HRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210568

Experiences of Sexual Harassment: Results from a Representative Survey

Barbara A. Gutek

Claremont Graduate School

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

August, 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Gutek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 015593

Paper presented at the symposium; Sandra Tangri (chair); Sexual Harassment at Work: Evidence, Remedies, and Implications; at the annual American Psychological Association Convention, August, 1981, Los Angeles.

The research reported here was supported by NIMH grant USPHS-MH-32606-01.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment:
Results from a Representative Survey

Sexual harassment at work has recently received considerable attention. Several noteworthy books have appeared on the topic, including Farley's (1978) "Sexual Shakedown", MacKinnon's (1979) "Sexual Harassment of Working Women", Fuller's (1979) "Sexual Harassment: How To Recognize and Deal with It", Neugarten and Shafritz's (1980) edited volume, "Sexuality in Organizations". These books, along with the media, have popularized the concept and drawn attention to sexual harassment as a social and legal problem. Finally, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has been active in setting guidelines about employers' liabilities and employees' rights to work in a harassment-free environment.

Research has also progressed on the topic, providing information on the existence of sexual harassment, how people cope with it, who harasses and is harassed, and how the sexual composition of the labor force, sex segregation of jobs, and patterns of communcation and control at work facilitate the occurrence of sexual harassment. Recently, two large-scale studies have been completed, one by the Merit System Protection Board examining sexual harassment in the federal workforce (MSPB, 1981), and the other a NIMH-funded study of working men and women on the West Coast. This paper presents the methodology and some descriptive results of the West Coast worker survey.

The study is actually the third survey on the topic conducted at University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Each survey was also pre-tested at least once. The first two surveys were large pilot studies. The first pilot was a study of 399 Los Angeles working men and women conducted in the fall of 1978 (Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher, & Russell, 1980). The second had a smaller sample (N=281) and was in the field in February of 1980. Both pilot studies were 25-minute telephone interviews of both men and women. Both sexes served as interviewers after analyses of the first pilot showed no significant differences in rate of responses or quality of responses for sex of interviewer, controlling for sex of respondent (Handschumacher & Gutek, Note 1).

Method

Instrument

A twenty-five minute interview was planned. Topics in the interview included questions about the respondent's work, job characteristics, and work climate. There were also questions concerned with the respondents' experience of certain social-sexual behaviors on the current and previous jobs, including detailed information about one particular experience, information that included harasser characteristics. Other questions asked respondents' definitions of sexual harassment, whether the respondent had suffered any negative consequences

from sexual harassment, attitudes about male-female interaction at work, and demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Sampling

A sampling strategy was devised to yield a representative sample of working adults in Los Angeles County, stratified by sex. It was planned that 400 women and 800 men would be interviewed.

The survey universe was defined as persons who fit all of these qualifications: 18 or older, currently employed outside the home 20 hours or more a week, must have had worked for at least the last 3 months, and must come in contact with members of the opposite sex at work, either as co-workers, supervisors, subordinates, customers, or clients.

The method of random digit dialing was used to select households. The sample of households to be called was developed by a Field Research Corporation (FRC) computer program which generated randomized four-digit numbers coupled with all prefixes (Central Office Codes) operating in Los Angeles County. In this way, all communities in Los Angeles County fell into the sample in proportion to the population of telephone households and all operating telephone numbers had an equal probability of being included in the sample, regardless of whether or not they were published in the latest telephone directories. The telephone sampling program output was pre-printed Call Record Sheets, each of which was a cluster of 20 telephone numbers. For this survey, 490 clusters of 20 listings each were used, for a total of 9,800

telephone numbers.

When a household spokesperson was reached, interviewers followed systematic selection procedures to determine the number of eligible persons in the household, if any, and to select that person who was the "designated respondent". Strictly speaking, the "probability of selection" is not known in advance when one is screening to locate qualified respondents within households, since the incidence of such qualification is not known. In each household, interviewers asked for the first names (or initials) of all eligible adults and listed these in descending order of age on a screening form. A random selection pattern -- the Kish method (Kish, 1965) -- was pre-printed on the screening form to designate that person in the household to be interviewed -- the designated respondent. Initially, all eligible adults were listed on the screening form. Once the quota of 400 men was reached, only eligible women were listed for selection.

Interviewers made a minimum of four attempts to reach a spokesperson at a residential household. Business and disconnected phones received no callbacks. Up to two more attempts were made to reach the designated respondent once that person had been identified. If the designated respondent refused or broke off the interview, up to four additional attempts were made to convert that refusal or termination into a completed interview. Callbacks were made on different days and at different hours during the interviewing period.

A total of 1232 interviews were completed by both male and female interviewers employed by the Field Research Corporation of San Francisco. Of these, 827 interviews were with women and 405 were with men. A total of 65 interviews were done in Spanish by bi-lingual interviewers using Spanish language questionnaires. Interviewing was done in June and July, 1980.

This final sample of 1232 respondents was obtained from 5,537 usable listings. There was a 25% rejection rate, computed by dividing the number of completed interviews by the number of eligible respondents -- 1646. (See Table 1).

Results and Discussion

The sample constituted a random sample of working households in Los Angeles County. In order to arrive at a representative sample of respondents, each case had to be weighted by the number of eligible respondents in the household.

In this particular study, independent samples of men and women were sought. However, administrative simplicity and efficiency were gained by assuming independence of male and female selection in the first part of the sampling and interviewing process when working to complete the male quota of 400 interviews. This assumption is based on the fact that, in principle, any given household could be drawn into both the male and female sample frames and that both an eligible male and an eligible female from the same household would then be interviewed. However, the

chances of a household falling into both samples are so remote that the bias is virtually zero.

However, the number of eligible respondents varied from household to household, and only one interview was conducted in each household. Thus, the selection probability for any given respondent was the reciprocal of the number of eligible respondents in the household. Therefore, a post-interview weight was applied to the questionnaire data for each respondent, in order to generalize from the data. Interviews in households where an eligible male was selected were weighted by the number of eligible males the household contains; those interviews where an eligible female was selected were weighted by the number of eligible females in the household.

A disadvantage of such weighting is that it artificially inflates sample size. We compared the weighted and unweighted distributions of all variables and found that, in this sample, all the distributions of the unweighted variables were within the 95% confidence interval of the distribution of the weighted variables. Thus, the results of the unweighted data constitute a generalizable sample of working men and women in Los Angeles County. The results reported here all use the unweighted data.

Sample Characteristics

The sample is described in Table 2. The average working man in Los Angeles County is significantly older than the average working woman. The distribution of education is also

significantly different for the sexes: the distribution for men is flatter than the distribution for women; men are more likely than women to have very little education or at least a bachelor's degree. The sexes also differ in marital status, with men more likely to be married and women more likely to be divorced. Almost half of the women's sample do not have a live-in partner. Of those women who do have a live-in partner, a large majority of those live-in partners (90%) are working. Men are more likely to have a live-in partner, but she is less likely to work outside the home. Working men are significantly more likely to have children. The total family income of working women is significantly less than the total family income of working men, despite the fact that women's husbands are more likely to work than men's wives. Finally, the ethnicity distribution was not significantly different for the sexes.

In summary, compared to the average working woman, the average working man in Los Angeles is older, is more likely to be married, is more likely to have children, is more likely to have a spouse who does not work outside the home, and has a higher total family income.

Definition of Sexual Harassment

The approach toward sexual harassment taken in this research has been broad, asking about a variety of social-sexual behaviors. (See Gutek, et al., 1980, for more information on the rationale.) A definition of sexual harassment was not given. Rather

respondents were first asked about a variety of social-sexual experiences, and later were asked which of those behaviors constituted sexual harassment. Eighty-five percent of respondents said they had heard the term, "sexual harassment".

Table 3 shows the percentage of male and female respondents who believe each category of behavior is sexual harassment. The eight categories of behavior were: sexual remarks meant to be complimentary, sexual remarks meant to be insulting, sexual looks and gestures meant to be complimentary, sexual looks and gestures meant to be insulting, non-sexual touching, sexual touching, dating as a requirement of the job, and sexual activity as a requirement of the job.

In general, women are more likely than men to consider the behaviors sexual harassment. The biggest difference between the sexes is in their evaluation of sexual touching, which over four-fifths of women consider sexual harassment, compared to less than three-fifths of men.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment

Table 4 provides data on the experiences of men and women. Three sets of figures are shown. The first set is the percentage of men and women who reported experiencing each of the eight behaviors on the current job. The second set is the percentage of men and women who reported that they had experienced that class of behavior on either the current job or on a previous job

in their working lives. The third set is the percentage of men and women who reported each behavior at least once in their working lives AND, in addition, said that they considered that class of behavior to be sexual harassment. The final item, "ever experience a behavior you considered sexual harassment", is the sum of the individual experiences, eliminating multiple experiences. In other words, 37.3% of the men and 53.1% of the women reported experiencing at least one of the social-sexual behaviors that they consider sexual harassment during their working lives.

An interesting pattern emerges from the results reported in Table 4. Men do not report fewer incidents than women on the current job. In fact, they report significantly more sexual touching, a finding that seems to be a result of the fact that men are more likely than women to call a touch sexual if the initiator is opposite sex (Gutek, Cohen, & Morasch, Note 2). Comparing the reports of the sexes when combined across current and all previous jobs shows that women are generally more likely to report such experiences. Perhaps men were less able to remember experiences on previous jobs because they reported less memorable (i.e., exciting or traumatic) experiences on the current job. In spite of the fact that men and women report comparable experiences of each class of behavior, strong sex differences emerge when we consider whether men and women have experienced a behavior that they consider to be sexual harassment. These data reflect the sex differences in what is considered sexual

harassment.[1]

In general, the majority of both sexes reported social-sexual experiences at work. The most common experiences involved behaviors where the respondent thought the initiator had intended to be complimentary (although the behavior might not necessarily have been received that way). The behavior that showed the biggest discrepancy between the sexes was sexual touching. It happened frequently to both sexes, although it is quite likely that men and women may include a different range or repertoire of behaviors in the category "sexual touching". Moreover, the majority of sexual touching received by women is objectionable to them, whereas the majority received by men is not objectionable to them.

The respondents who reported sexual touching, required socializing, or required sexual activity, either on the current job or on any previous job, were asked a series of questions about one such experience. We gathered more information on these classes of social-sexual incidents because they constitute more serious sexual harassment. Tables 5 and 6 apply to this subset of the sample.

Each respondent who reported sexual touching, expected socializing, or expected sexual activity, was asked to explain what happened. A file of these open-ended responses was created, and each response was rated on a number of dimensions. One rater, who had compiled definitions of sexual harassment, rated

each open-ended response on the extent to which it was sexual harassment. Some of the responses were very short (e.g., "playing around in a playful way") and/or non-informative (e.g., "I have no idea"). Nevertheless, the responses of females were significantly more likely than male responses to be labeled sexual harassment by the independent rater. Four other raters evaluated the open-ended comments on other dimensions. An examination of the relationship between the rating of sexual harassment and the mean rating of the four raters showed strong positive relationships for several variables; these included stressing negative conditions (gamma=.73), stressing the initiator's group (e.g., "men are like that") (gamma=.60), stressing the initiator at a personal level (e.g., "he's like that") (gamma=.47), and stressing negative outcomes (gamma=.43). The rating of sexual harassment was negatively related to stressing the relationship (gamma=-.27) and stressing mutuality (gamma=-.69).

In summary, compared to men, the comments of women about sexual touching, expected socializing, or expected sexual activity are more likely to be called sexual harassment by an independent rater. Ratings of the same comments by others showed that an experience is labeled sexual harassment when negative conditions are stressed, when negative outcomes are stressed, and when the initiator is discussed. An experience is less likely to be labeled sexual harassment if the relationship between the two is mentioned or if mutuality is stressed.

Profile of Initiators

Table 6 presents a profile of initiators of sexual touching, expected socializing, and expected sexual activity, whether or not the activities were labeled sexual harassment by the independent rater. These results corroborate the findings of the first pilot study (Gutek, et al., 1980, p. 261). Men and women describe opposite sex initiators that are very different. Women are significantly more likely than men to report that the initiator behaves "this way" towards others. Women reported a significantly older male initiator than did men. Over half of the female initiators were under 30. And, according to the men, almost three-fourths of the female initiators were not married. Furthermore, almost three-fourths of the men reported that their female initiators were above average in physical attractiveness. Finally, women are more likely than men to report that the initiator was a supervisor.

In summary, the picture that emerges of the female initiator -- young, unmarried, attractive, non-supervisory, who may or may not behave "this way" towards other men--suggests enticement (Fuller, Note 3), not harassment. Many of these experiences may be ego-enhancing to men, whereas the incidents that women discuss may include some ego-enhancing experiences but also include sexual harassment.

The questionnaire also included information on the negative consequences of sexual harassment (Table 7). These items were

asked toward the end of the questionnaire, and were separate from reports of specific social-sexual experiences. For example, the first of these questions, "Have you ever quit a job because you were sexually harassed?", made no attempt to find out the specific behavior involved. Whatever the behavior was, it was severe enough to cause the respondent to quit, or transfer, or talk to someone, etc. More women than men reported each of these negative consequences. Overall, 31% of women have either been fired, quit a job, asked for a job transfer, quit applying for a job, or talked to someone as a result of sexual harassment.

Organizational Ambience

The organizational ambience, or general atmosphere at work, can affect the way people behave at work. A management policy that forbids sexual harassment and that is enforced at all levels of the organization is likely to minimize sexual harassment. Some work environments are "sexualized". For example, Martin (1978) researched a work environment dominated by men, a police department, and pointed out that women's sexuality was constantly brought to attention. Other work environments with less skewed sex ratios may still have an informal norm of sexual jokes, innuendoes, or harassment (cf. Gutek & Nakamura, in press). The questionnaire contained information on the work environment and on the attitudes of workers about male-female interactions. Table 8 shows the results by sex of answers to some questions about the work environment. About one-third of both sexes felt that there was at least some pressure for men to flirt with women

at their workplaces, and they perceived a little less pressure for women to flirt with men. Almost 60% of women and over 40% of men thought that physical attractiveness was at least somewhat important on their jobs. A majority of women and about 40% of men said that physical attractiveness affects the way they are treated by the opposite sex at work. Physical attractiveness is significantly more important for women than men.

Attitudes

Besides assessing aspects of the environment, the questionnaire also contained questions about other workers on the job and attitudes about sexuality in general. Respondents were asked to rate both men and women separately, for example, on how seductively men dress and how seductively women dress. An examination of these results showed that each sex tended to present their own sex in a more favorable light, and reacted to the other sex is a somewhat more stereotyped manner. In order to unconfound this bias from attitudes to some extent, we created new variables to reflect the way each sex felt about the other sex and then about their own sex. Table 9 shows the results of these analyses on attitudes about dressing to be sexually attractive and acting sexually seductive at work. In general, both sexes thought both sexes dress to be sexually attractive at work. Men were more likely than women to think the opposite sex dresses to be attractive, and women agreed that their sex dresses to be sexually attractive. About half of both sexes thought that at least some men and women present a sexually seductive image at

work. Men are significantly more likely than women to think the opposite sex dresses seductively, but women do not think women present a more seductive image than men think men do. In fact, women think that men behave in a less seductive way than men think men do. In both cases, the "my sex" scores are closer together than the "opposite sex" scores, indicating that both sexes rate themselves more alike than they rate the opposite sex.

Table 10 shows a similar analysis of attitudes about male-female interactions. Women were more likely to think that sex roles encourage men to proposition women than vice versa. In the case of being complimented by requests for sex from an opposite sex person, there was a bigger difference for reports of own sex than opposite sex. That is, compared to men, women thought the opposite sex is complimented more, but men say that men are complimented much more than women say women are complimented. Men admitted that men do more to bring about such propositions than women think women do, but women do not think men do more than men think women do. Sixty-five percent of men agreed that men encourage such requests but only 45% of women agreed that women encourage such requests. The same pattern shows up on an analysis of whether a person could do something to prevent the incident. There was no significant difference in the way each sex evaluates opposite sex but there was for own sex. About 80% of men thought men could prevent such activity. The fact that men and women each thought the opposite sex has the same ability to control the situation is surprising, in light of the

tremendous sex differences in organizational positions, authority and power. In reality, other things being equal, women are likely to have less control over their behavior at work than men. But men seem to overestimate the control women have, and women underestimate the control that men have.

Women were more aware of power differences than men in their responses to the questions on wanting to dominate the target person. Women are more likely than men to say that the opposite sex seeks domination in sexual requests. On the other hand, somewhat more women than men thought that their own sex wants to dominate the other sex. The last items were whether people were flattered if an attractive opposite-sex person asks them to engage in sexual activity. Again, there was a larger effect for "my sex" than "opposite sex". About 86% of women and 63% of men thought the opposite sex would be flattered if propositioned by an attractive person, but almost 90% of men and 56% of women said their own sex would be flattered. This large difference was borne out through a question (positioned much earlier in the questionnaire) asking the respondent if he/she would be flattered or insulted if propositioned by an opposite-sex person at work. Men were significantly more likely to report being flattered ($t=4.88$, $df=1$, $p<.001$).

Summary

This report only scratches the surface of a very rich data set.

The data constitute a representative sample of working men and women in Los Angeles County, with women oversampled. A variety of social-sexual behaviors are prevalent, and they are supported by differential work experiences of men and women, and attitudes and stereotypes about what each sex finds attractive at work.

Despite the fact that men complain that the presence of women will disrupt the work environment, they are the ones who report ego-enhancing activities initiated by attractive young women and they admit that men are flattered by the presence of social-sexual behaviors in the workplace. Only a few men report experiences that resulted in negative consequences from sexual harassment.

Some women also report ego-enhancing experiences, and think other women could prevent such experiences if they wanted to. Also half of the female respondents thought that women in general were flattered by sexual overtures from men. But only 17% of women said that THEY would be flattered by such overtures. And women are more likely than men to label the social-sexual behaviors as sexual harassment, and to experience behavior which they consider to be sexual harassment. Fifty-three percent of women reported that they had experienced at least one sexually harassing behavior in their work lives, and almost one-third reported some negative job consequences.

There is a great deal of ambiguity around the issue of sexuality at work. More research -- as well as discussion, training and

education programs, and legal help -- will help separate sexual harassment, sexual interest, and sexual fantasy from occupational role. The spillover of sex role into work role has negative consequences for workers and for organizations (cf. Nieva & Gutek, 1981, chap. 5). It is clear from these data that sexuality is present at work, and will probably continue to be present. But the elimination of exploitation and coercive sexual behavior will result in a more comfortable and professional work environment.

Footnotes

1. The questions used in these surveys differ from some on sexual harassment that stress the fact that the behavior is unwelcome. The question "Have you ever experienced unwelcome sexual touching?" could be expected to yield different responses than our questions. The choice was made in this research to be very general, and to study positive as well as negative forms of social-sexual behavior. We also tried to be objective rather than subjective wherever feasible. However, even an "objective" question on being touched sexually appears to be highly subjective!

I would like to thank Charles Y. Nakamura, Bruce Morasch, and Paul Phillips for their contributions.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Barbara A. Gutek, Faculty in Psychology, Claremont Graduate School, The Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California 91711.

Reference Notes

1. Handschumacher, I. & Gutek, B. A. Interviewer effects in surveys dealing with sensitive topics. Western Psychological Association convention, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 1-5, 1980.
2. Gutek, B. A., Cohen, A., & Morasch, B. Interpreting social-sexual signals in a work setting. Unpublished manuscript, August, 1981.
3. Fuller, M. Personal Communication, June, 1981.

References

Farley, L. Sexual Shakedown. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Fuller, M. Sexual Harassment: How to Recognize and Deal with It. Annapolis, Md.: What Would Happen If..., 1979.

Gutek, B. A. & Nakamura, C.Y. Gender roles and sexuality in the world of work. In E. Allgeier & N. McCormick (Eds.), Gender Roles and Sexual Behavior: Changing Boundaries. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1982.

Gutek, B. A., Nakamura, C. Y., Gahart, M., Handschumacher, I., & Russell, D. Sexuality and the workplace. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1980, 1 (3), 255-265.

Kish, L. Survey Sampling. New York: Wiley, 1965.

MacKinnon, C. Sexual Harassment of Working Women. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Martin, S. E. Sexual politics in the workplace: the interactional world of policewomen. Symbolic Interaction, 1978, 1 (2), 44-60.

Merit System Protection Board. Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is It a Problem? Washington, D. C.: U.S.G.P.O., March, 1981.

Neugarten, D. A. & Shafritz, J. M. (Eds.) Sexuality in Organizations: Romantic and Coercive Behaviors at Work. Oak Park, Ill.: Moore Publishing Co., 1980.

Nieva, V. F. & Gutek, B. A. Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective. New York: Praeger Publishing Co., 1981.

Table 1

DISPOSITION OF TELEPHONE LISTINGS

	Number
Total telephone listings called	9,800
Non-usable listings	4,263
Not assigned, disconnected	2,634
Business listing	1,629
Usable listings	5,537
No answer after all attempts	1,061
Busy on last several attempts	22
No adult available after all attempts	94
Designated respondent not available	198
Communications barrier	75
Terminated after starting (conversion unsuccessful)	30
Refused to cooperate	384
No qualified respondent in household (No one working)	2,221
Selected respondent not qualified (does not work with men/women)	160
Other	60
Interviews completed	1,232
Males	405
In English	380
In Spanish	25
Females	827
In English	787
In Spanish	40

Table 2

Characteristics of Random Sample

of Working Men and Women

	Males	Females	
Age	x = 46.0	x = 41.85	t=13.89***
Education	(N=405)	(N=826)	x^2=17.05**
0-8	7.4%	3.8%	
9-11	4.7%	5.7%	
12	20.7%	28.5%	
some col.	35.3%	35.6%	
BA etc.	18.3%	16.0%	
Grad. sch. or degree	13.6%	10.4%	
Marital Status	(N=405)	(N=825)	x^2=47.20***
Married	67.7%	49.9%	
Widowed	1.0%	4.6%	
Divorced	7.2%	15.8%	
Separated	2.0%	3.9%	
Never married	20.0%	21.8%	
Living together	2.2%	4.0%	
Spouses Employment	(N=283)	(N=445)	x^2=236.30***
Full or part-time	37.8%	90.1%	
Unemployed, looking	2.5%	2.2%	
Unemployed, not looking	17.0%	1.8%	
Retired, housewives	42.8%	5.8%	
No live-in partner	(30.1% of total)	(46.1% of total)	
Have Children	(N=405)	(N=827)	x^2=22.35***
yes	52.8%	38.5%	
No	47.2%	61.5%	
Total Family Income	(N=391)	(N=778)	x^2=22.59***
Under $10,000	7.4%	12.9%	
$10-19,999	22.8%	31.5%	
$20-29,999	30.2%	23.7%	
$30,000 +	39.6%	32.0%	
Ethnicity	(N=400)	(N=824)	x^2=2.58
White	69.5%	66.4%	
Black	12.3%	12.3%	
Asian	4.3%	4.9%	
Hispanic	13.5%	15.3%	
Other	0.5	1.2	

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 3

What is Sexual Harassment?

Is sexual harassment	Males	Females	x^2
Positive verbal	21.9%	33.5%	15.7***
Negative verbal	70.3%	85.5%	37.5***
Positive looks, gestures	18.9%	28.9%	12.7***
Negative looks, gestures	61.6%	80.3%	46.0***
Non-sexual touching	6.6%	7.3%	0.1
Sexual touching	58.6%	84.3%	90.2***
Expected socializing	91.1%	95.8%	10.0***
Expected sexual activity	94.5%	98.0%	10.1***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4

Experiences of social-sexual behaviors

	Males	Females	x^2
Ever experienced on current job	(N=405)	(N=827)	
Positive verbal	46.0%	50.1%	1.67
Negative verbal	12.6	12.2	0.01
Positive looks, gestures	47.3	51.6	1.76
Negative looks, gestures	12.3	9.1	2.61
Non-sexual touching	73.5	68.9	2.48
Sexual touching	20.9	15.3	5.52**
Expected socializing	2.7	2.8	0.00
Expected sexual activity	1.0	1.8	0.74
Ever experienced on any job			
Postive verbal	60.7%	68.1%	6.17**
Negative verbal	19.3	23.3	2.40
Positive looks, gestures	56.3	66.6	12.04***
Negative looks, gestures	19.3	20.3	0.13
Non-sexual touching	78.0	74.4	1.78
Sexual touching	33.3	33.1	0.00
Expected socializing	8.4	12.0	3.24
Expected sexual activity	3.5	7.7	7.70**
Ever experienced and label it sexual harassment			
Positive verbal	10.4%	18.9%	13.91***
Negative verbal	12.1	19.8	10.83***
Positive looks, gestures	8.1	16.2	14.37***
Negative looks, gestures	9.6	15.4	7.17**
Non-sexual touching	3.5	3.6	0.00
Sexual touching	12.3	24.2	22.82***
Expected socializing	7.4	10.9	3.35[a]
Expected sexual activity	3.2	7.6	8.83**
Have you ever experienced sexual harassment	37.3	53.1	26.6***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ [a] $p = .06$

Table 5

Independent Rating of Sexual Touching,
Socializing or Sexual Activity
by Sex of Recipient

Is it sexual harassment?	Males	Females
Definitely	12.2%	34.6%
Probably	12.2%	19.0%
Uncertain	39.5%	31.1%
Probably Not	18.4%	9.2%
Definitely Not	17.7%	6.0%
	100.0%	100.0%
	(147)	(315)

X^2=43.96, df=4, p .001

Table 6

Profile of Initiators

How long associated with initiator?

	Less than 1 day	Less than 2 months	2-6 mos.	Over 6 mos.	total (N)
Female Rs	5.8	20.0	24.2	50.0	100% (10)
Male Rs	5.6	23.8	25.2	45.5	100% (143)

x^2=1.12 df=3 p=n.s.

Initiator Behaves This Way Towards Others

	Yes	No	total (N)
Female Rs	71.0	29.0	100% (259)
Male Rs	52.3	47.7	100% (109)

x^2=11.1 df=1 p < .001

Initiator Age

	under 30	30-39	40-49	over 50	total (N)
Female Rs	19.0	31.8	26.0	17.0	100% (311)
Male Rs	56.6	34.4	9.0	0.0	100% (145)

x^2=92.9 df=4 p < .001

Initiator Married

	Yes	No	total (N)
Female Rs	65.4	34.6	100% (288)
Male Rs	28.4	71.6	100% (131)

x^2=51.7 df=1 p < .001

Attractiveness of Initiator

	Above average attractiveness	Not above average	total (N)
Female Rs	41.8	58.2	100% (306)
Male Rs	71.6	28.4	100% (141)

x^2=33.1 df=1 p < .001

Initiator is a Supervisor

	Yes	No	total (N)
Female Rs	44.8	56.3	100% (306)
Male Rs	5.5	43.7	(139)

x^2=64.5 df=1 p < .001

Table 7

Percentages of Respondents
Experiencing Negative Consequences
of Social/Sexual Behaviors

	YES	NO
Ever quit job because sexually harassed?		
Female	9.1	90.9
Male	1.0	99.0
Ever transfer because sexually harassed?		
Female	5.1	94.9
Male	0.7	99.3
Ever talk to a co-worker over sexual harassment?		
Female	22.5	77.5
Male	5.5	94.5
Ever quit trying for a job because you were sexually harassed?		
Female	9.6	90.4
Male	1.7	98.3
Ever lose a job because you refused sex?		
Female	6.9	93.1
Male	2.2	97.8

Table 8

Sexual Pressures at Work

Social Pressure to Flirt

	Women Flirt With Men		Men Flirt With Women	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
None	69.4	72.3	66.9	68.1
Some	25.6	21.3	26.3	22.1
Alot	5.1	6.4	6.8	9.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(395)	(815)	(810)	(396)
	x^2=3.2 df=2 p=.20		x^2=4.6 df=2 p=.10	

How Important is Physical Attractiveness in Your Job

	Males	Females
Not at all important	56.6	40.5
Somewhat important	32.3	41.1
Very important	11.1	18.4
	100.0%	100.0%
	(405)	(825)

x^2=29.8 df=2 p < .001

How Important is Physical Attractiveness in Treatment by Opposite Sex at Work

	Males	Females
Not at all important	60.3	44.6
Somewhat important	33.3	39.4
Very important	6.4	16.0
	100.0	100.0
	(390)	(813)

x^2=34.2 df=2 p < .001

Table 9

Attitudes About Physical Presentation at Work

	The Opposite Sex Dresses to be Sexually Attractive		"My" sex dresses to be Sexually Attractive	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
None	3.3	7.2	5.0	4.1
Hardly any	16.0	30.4	25.9	15.8
Some	46.0	47.3	50.6	48.4
Most	34.8	15.1	18.5	31.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(400)	(816)	(401)	(821)
	x^2=77.2 df=3	p < .001	x^2=32.3 df=3	p < .001

	The Opposite Sex Presents Sexually Seductive Image		"My" Sex Presents a Sexually Seductive Image	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
None	4.0	8.8	6.3	5.1
Hardly any	36.6	41.7	39.9	37.7
Some	52.8	43.4	47.5	51.2
Most	6.6	6.1	6.3	6.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(396)	(816)	(396)	(817)
	x^2=15.2 df=3	p < .001	x^2=1.77 df=3	p=ns

Table 10

Sex Differences in Attitudes About Sexuality at Work

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	
Opposite sex						
Male Rs	43.3	36.1	16.6	4.0	100.0%	x^2=41.7
Female Rs	34.4	26.6	27.7	11.3	100.0%	p < .001
"My" sex						
Male Rs	36.9	30.9	24.4	7.8	100.0%	x^2=45.7
Female Rs	55.2	27.3	14.4	3.1	100.0%	p < .001
Sex roles encourage _____ to request sex at work.						
Opposite sex						
Male Rs	29.5	29.8	34.4	6.3	100.0%	x^2=87.2
Female Rs	18.5	16.7	37.5	27.3	100.0%	p < .001
"My" sex						
Male Rs	11.8	16.2	45.9	26.2	100.0%	x^2=209.3
Female Rs	43.2	24.6	27.1	5.2	100.0%	p < .001
_____ is complimented by requests for sex.						
Opposite sex						
Male Rs	15.8	29.7	38.4	16.1	100.0%	x^2=3.71
Female Rs	13.9	25.7	43.2	17.2	100.0%	p=ns
"My" sex						
Male Rs	11.1	23.3	50.9	14.6	100.0%	x^2=64.0
Female Rs	28.9	26.4	30.7	14.1	100.0%	p < .001
_____ does something to bring it about.						
Opposite sex						
Male Rs	8.5	16.8	38.5	36.2	100.0%	x^2=2.61
Female Rs	6.5	17.2	42.0	34.3	100.0%	p=ns
"My" sex						
Male Rs	7.0	14.0	43.7	35.4	100.0%	x^2=16.3
Female Rs	11.2	19.1	33.4	36.3	100.0%	p < .001
_____ could do something to prevent it.						
Opposite sex						
Male Rs	31.0	42.6	19.8	6.6	100.0%	x^2=45.7
Female Rs	21.0	33.4	26.5	19.0	100.0%	p < .001
"My" sex						
Male Rs	32.2	38.8	21.5	7.4	100.0%	x^2=9.2
Female Rs	35.7	30.6	22.7	11.0	100.0%	p < .05
_____ wants to dominate men/women.						

Table 10 (continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	
Opposite sex						
Male Rs	9.1	27.7	42.9	20.2	100.0%	x^2=126.6
Female Rs	7.3	6.8	39.2	46.7	100.0%	$p < .001$
"My" sex						
Male Rs	3.8	6.9	36.0	53.3	100.0%	x^2=195.1
Female Rs	20.6	22.0	39.5	17.9	100.0%	$p < .001$

_____ flattered if asked by attractive man/woman.